



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/837,449	04/17/2001	Hani Elgebaly	42390P11413	2387
8791	7590	05/19/2006	EXAMINER	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN 12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD SEVENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030			STRANGE, AARON N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2153	

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/837,449	ELGEBALY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Aaron Strange	2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 April 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-5,7,8,10,21-24 and 31-42 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5,7,8,10,21-24 and 31-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04172006.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Allowable Subject Matter

1. The previous indication of allowable subject matter regarding claims 6 and 10 is withdrawn herein. The subject matter of claims 6 and 10 that was thought to be potentially allowable has been removed via amendment, and all limitations are taught by Goldberg.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 3/6/06, with respect to claims 1 and 21 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3. With regard to claim 1, while Applicant has incorporated asserted to be "analogous to the language deemed allowable by the Office in claim 6" (Page 13, Line 21 to Page 14, Line 2 of Remarks), the language is not the same and is much broader than the language previously presented in claim 6. Therefore, it is not considered to be allowable and is rejected below.

4. With regard to claim 8, while Applicant has incorporated subject matter from claims 9 and 10, the claims are still not allowable since they are unclear. Despite the amendments to the subject matter previously presented in claim 10, the language of the claim remains unclear and appears to be taught by Goldberg, as discussed below.

5. With regard to claim 21, Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. Applicant has merely provided a general assertion that Goldberg "is not believed to anticipate exactly" the newly added limitations. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with this assertion, and claim 21 is rejected below.

Claim Objections

6. Claims 32 and 33 objected to because of the following informalities:
 - a. Claims 32 and 33 contain a typographical error "one or more of machines".
7. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

8. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

9. Claims 31-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

10. The term "machine-readable media" is not limited to statutory subject matter. The specification fails to define "machine-readable media", and a piece of paper with code written on it is known in the art to be "machine-readable", using technology such as optical character scanner or bar code readers. Since the claim is not limited to statutory subject matter, it is not statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

11. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

12. Claims 8,10,23 and 31-42 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

13. Claim 8 recites the limitation "the second network address" in line 20. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claim 37 is rejected under the same rationale.

14. With further regard to claim 8, the limitation "waiting for data to be sent to the second endpoint from the first endpoint" is unclear. Based on the claim language, it appears that the registration server is waiting. However, Applicant's previous discussion

of this subject matter asserted that the second endpoint is waiting (at least Page 17, Lines 1-7 of Remarks filed 11/19/2004). Claim 37 is rejected under the same rationale.

15. With regard to claim 23, as discussed in the Office actions of 12/1/05 (¶17) and 4/7/05 (¶17-18), the language of the claim is unclear.

Claim 23 recites "identifying that the second session registration comprises a network address that is routable" in lines 9-10. However, claim 22 states that the second session registration comprises a non-routable network address. Furthermore, lines 5-6 of claim 23 recite "identifying that the second session registration comprises a network address that is non-routable". It is unclear if there are multiple network addresses in the second session registration, or if the method is intended to comprise different steps depending on whether the network address is routable or non-routable.

Claim 23 also appears to register the first endpoint twice in two different manners (Lines 6-7 and 10-11). It is unclear if these are intended to be alternative methods of registration or if both registrations are executed.

Claim 41 is rejected under the same rationale.

16. With regard to claim 31, the limitation "machine-readable media having associated instructions" is unclear. Such instructions are not necessarily tangibly embodied on a computer readable medium, and are not necessarily contained within the "machine-readable media". Therefore, the instructions do not materially affect the machine-readable media, and would impart no patentable weight. The Examiner

recommends amending the claim to specify that the instructions are recorded on a computer readable medium, or a similar recitation which clearly shows the relationship between the instructions and the medium. Claims 32-42 contain similar recitations and are rejected under the same rationale.

17. All claims not individually rejected are rejected by virtue of their dependency from the above claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

18. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

19. Claims 1-3 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Goldberg et al. (WO 02/03217 A1).

20. With regard to claim 1, Goldberg discloses a method for establishing a communication session through a network translation device with a communication

protocol utilizing a single communication port for setting up the communication session and transferring data the communication session, the method comprising:

preparing a session setup for a session with a first machine, the session setup identifying an internal origin address (internal IP address) and a first internal port to which the first machine (Client B) expects a response to the session setup (Page 6, Lines 21-23);

sending the session setup to a second machine (application server) through the network translation device, the second machine at least temporarily an endpoint to the communication session (Fig 12, and Page 20, Lines 2-10) and being configured to recognize if the session setup includes the internal origin address, and if so to associate with the first machine the routable external origin address of the network translation device (Page 6, Line 19 to Page 7, Line 9);

receiving by the first machine (Client B) a communication session initiation request from a third machine (Client A), said initiation having an associated external address/port for the third machine (Page 20, Lines 2-5); and

sending an acknowledgement to said initiation to the external address/port so as to prime the network translation device to receive the session from the third machine (Page 20, Lines 6-13).

21. With regard to claim 2, Goldberg further discloses sending content for the communication session from the first machine to the third machine, wherein the third

machine is configured to wait for content from the first machine before the third machine sends content to the first machine (Page 20, Lines 28-30).

22. With regard to claim 3, Goldberg further discloses receiving data for the session from the third machine responsive to said priming (Page 20, Lines 15-18).

23. With regard to claim 4, Goldberg further discloses that the protocol comprises modification to an original communication protocol (SIP) requiring utilizing different communication ports for setting up the communication session and transferring data during the communication session (Page 19, Lines 21-32).

24. With regard to claim 21, Goldberg discloses a method for a first endpoint internal to a network translation device to set up a communication session with a second endpoint external to the network translation device, the method comprising:

contacting a registration server to resolve an alias for the second endpoint (INVITE/SDP is sent to app server);
receiving a first session registration from the registration server (INFO/NAT message is received from app server), the first session registration comprising a network address for the second endpoint that is routable, and a content port to which content should be sent to for the second endpoint (Page 20, Lines 13-15); and
modifying a protocol for the communication session requiring the first endpoint to complete setting up the communication session and await receiving content from the

second endpoint (Fig 12 and Page 20, Lines 16-30), said modifying including the first end point being configured to prime the network translation device by sending at least one network packet to the second endpoint at the routable address on the content port, before said completing setting up the communication session with the second endpoint (Send RTP/NAT message) (Page 20, Lines 2-30 and Fig 12); and

after said priming the network translation device, receiving content for the communication session on the content port (Page 20, Lines 28-29).

25. With regard to claim 22, Goldberg further discloses sending a second session registration for the first endpoint to the registration server, the second session registration comprising a network address for the first endpoint that is non-routable (Page 19, Lines 18-20).

26. With regard to claim 23, as best understood by the Examiner, Goldberg further discloses that the registration server receives session registrations from both the first and second endpoints. The server first determines which endpoints are located behind a NAT (Page 19, Lines 12-20). While Goldberg fails to specifically disclose that the devices are registered, this limitation is inherent, because the server provides the appropriate addressing information to each endpoint when assisting with the connection setup (Page 20, Lines 2-30).

27. With regard to claim 24, Goldberg further discloses that the registration server is configured to identify the non-routable network address within the second session registration, and responsive to said identifying, registering the first endpoint with respect to a routable address associated with the network translation device (Page 19, Lines 14-20).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

28. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

29. Claims 5 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldberg et al. (WO 02/03217 A1) in view of Fallentine et al. (US 2002/0042832).

30. With regard to claim 5, while the system disclosed by Goldberg shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose that the session setup includes an alias and a registration server receiving the session setup and registering the first machine with respect to the alias and its' external origin address.

Fallentine teaches a method of registering endpoints of a communication session

which reside behind a NAT using the IP address and alias of the endpoint. This would have been an advantageous addition to the system disclosed by Goldberg since it allows unique aliases to be used to identify each endpoint for session1 identification (¶48).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to register endpoints with respect to their external origin addresses and aliases, in order to provide unique identifiers for session identification.

31. With regard to claim 8, as best understood by the Examiner, Goldberg discloses a method for a registration server to facilitate communicating between a first endpoint (Client A) behind a network address translator (NAT) and a second endpoint (application server), comprising:

receiving a first registration for the first endpoint according to a protocol utilizing a single communication port for both setting up and transferring data during a communication session, said registration comprising an embedded network address (IP address) and port primed by the first endpoint (Page 6, Lines 21-23), said priming including sending data from the first endpoint using the port to prime the NAT to receive responsive data on the port (Page 20, Lines 2-30);

determining the embedded network address is a non-routable address (Different from the external address) (Page 7, Lines 4-9);

receiving from the second endpoint a resolution request for the alias (INFO/NAT message) (Page 20, Lines 20-21) and replying to said request with at least the apparent origin address (reINVITE message);

receiving an initiation for the session from the second endpoint (response w/SDP);

forwarding the session setup to the first endpoint at the apparent origin address (Page 20, Lines 20-30); and

determining whether the second network address is routable, and if so, waiting for data to be sent to the second endpoint from the first endpoint (Page 20, Lines 26-30).

However, Goldberg fails to specifically disclose that the session setup includes an alias and a registering the first endpoint with respect to the alias, port, and apparent origin address.

Fallentine teaches a method of registering endpoints of a communication session which reside behind a NAT using the IP address and alias of the endpoint. This would have been an advantageous addition to the system disclosed by Goldberg since it allows unique aliases to be used to identify each endpoint for session1 identification (¶48).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to register endpoints with respect to their external origin addresses and aliases, in order to provide unique identifiers for session identification.

Conclusion

32. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron Strange whose telephone number is 571-272-3959. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AS
5/15/06



GLENON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100